LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

VOL. XL · No. 1 JANUARY 1958

A Case for Optimism

D. N. Pritt, Q.C., examines prospects and persons in the battle for peace, 1958 phase.

★

Where do we Stand Now?

Labour should act on its policy, writes Councillor E. A. C. Roberts, engineers' delegate to T.U.C. and Labour Party Conference.

Other Articles include

NOTES OF THE MONTH

1. A Very New Year. 2. Strategic Mania. 3. Unilateralism, Neutralism and Nuclear War. (page 1)

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE COLONIES

H. B. Lim warns of dangers in Labour's Colonial Policy (page 28)

CHINA TODAY AND CHAUCER'S ENGLAND

As if Chaucer's England had leapt straight into Socialism, says R. Page Arnot (page 34)

DIARY OF A SPUTNIK

"Dogwatch" logs the first four weeks of Sputnik II (page 44)

ONE SHILLING AND SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARTH-WATCH

A HAPPY NEW YEAR and a bright frosty morning to you! Smart this month, aren't we? Do you like our lively new jacket? As we get along in our late 'thirties (thirty-eight come July) we must pay more attention to appearances, or so the fashion trade says. In fact, we are putting on dog and dressing to catch the eye, so that our faithful circulation-builders can more easily win the ear of new readers. The young trade unionist and shop steward may have thought we looked a bit staid, at a distance; this should make him whistle—and stop. Your cue to take him by the arm and—introduce us, please!

For this year must see a marked change for the better—or else. Leave the Queen droning her Christmas Message of Peace and Goodwill everywhere in 'her' domain (except Christmas Island?) and take a look back over recent months. The columns of a monthly make an ideal vantage point to earth-watch from. Thence you may trace the pattern of a deliberate War on the Mind. Nationally and internationally, by every medium: from employers and Ministers, from NATO missile-rattlers, from parliaments, palaces and presidencies, from pulpits and university lecterns; and above all, from millionaire press and the Babble Machines of radio and TV. You see the pattern not only in war on the unions in Britain, by grossest interference in their internal affairs, by bosses' men fifth-columnists and by wage-freeze offensives. It is waged not only against the forward movement of the Cypriot, Indonesian and Algerian. It is not only frantic counter-Sputnikery of cold-war politicians, military men with political missions or Hitler's former scientists turned stooge propagandists, who in chorus seek to shout down the Sputniks with their mouths in default of space-guns. Each and all of these, and a few more: thus they unite each and all of us.

With War on the Mind they greet the dawn of the era of peaceful competition, so much dreaded by them, so much to be welcomed by us all—as soon as our eyes are opened: their war-aims are to keep eyes shut to the prospect of permanent peace and all its consequences. As in William Blake's *French Revolution*, the warmongers see, like the French king and his peers,

'the courts of the Palace Forsaken, and Paris without a soldier, silent; for the noise was gone up And follow'd the army, and the Senate in peace sat beneath morning's beam.' Way back in 1790, Blake foresaw the great day when *'the laborious plowman And Shepherd, deliver'd from clouds of war'*, should come into their own and make *'the happy earth sing in its course, The mild peaceable nations be opened to heav'n, and men walk with their fathers in bliss.'* It is to prevent this that to-day they unleash their War on the Mind. And let us make no mistake. This unprecedented effort to sow defeatism, despair and self-distrust has its effect.

How important, then, is the job done by a handful of publications—of which we are proud that L.M. is one—to rouse people from what a Londoner calls 'the feeling of impotence that "They" control everything', and find a way out of 'this cruel prison of impotence and frustration'! Our new jacket sets off most valuable eye-openers on each of these three fronts: the advanced positions from which the labour movement can start, pointed out by Councillor E. A. C. Roberts (himself engineers' delegate to both T.U.C. and Labour Party Conference); the

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

1. *A Very New Year*

WHAT is our estimate of 1957? What is the outlook for 1958? We have entered new conditions in the world. This is recognised by all. But how new is perhaps still not recognised by some. Except in moments of revolutionary illumination the climate of human opinion tends to move more slowly than the march of events. 1917. 1945. 1949. And now the Year of the Sputniks. What next for 1958? Who can fail to see the way the world is going? For three centuries the rulers of the West have been accustomed to assume their superiority and their pre-ordained mission to settle the affairs of the rest of the world. Now reality has dealt a harsh blow to their complacency. Their backwardness has been displayed in the heavens, not only to themselves, but (oh horror! oh anguish!) to the 'backward coloured masses', to Asia and Africa, to that majority of mankind whom they affected to despise, terrorise and patronise, and who are now turning the weight in the scales of the future of the world.

No wonder the Western rulers are slow to recognise the era of Western bourgeois supremacy has ended for ever. They are loath to recognise that the leadership of humanity has now visibly passed to the

CONTENTS

JANUARY · 1958

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: 1. *A Very New Year;* 2. *Strategic Mania;* 3. *Unilateralism, Neutralism and Nuclear War,* by R.P.D.	1
A CASE FOR OPTIMISM, by D. N. Pritt, Q.C. ..	16
WHERE DO WE STAND NOW? by Councillor E. A. C. Roberts	22
THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE COLONIES, by H. B. Lim ..	28
DANGER! WOMEN AT WORK, by Angela Tuckett	32
CHINA TODAY AND CHAUCER'S ENGLAND, by R. Page Arnot	34
LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM ..	39
DIARY OF A SPUTNIK, by 'Dogwatch'	43
PAINTINGS BY DIEGO RIVERA ..	24-25
Book Reviews:	
Technical Education in the U.S.S.R., by C. E. Simmonds: *J. G. Crowther* ..	46
Exercises in the Dialectical Method, by D. D. Kosambi: *Ivor Montagu*	47
An Anthology of Chartist Literature, edited by Y. V. Kovalev: *F. Jackson* ..	47
Soviet Industry & Foreign Trade, by F. Koort: *G. Sinfield* ..	48

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new world of socialism and anti-imperialism. Forty years of achievement and painful ascent have culminated in this turning point of human history. In this sense with 1958 we are indeed entering a New Year—the first year of the recognised superiority of the new world. But the representatives of the old order are not yet ready to come to terms with reality. They dream of yet more monstrous engines of destruction to turn back the wheel of history. Therefore with 1958 we are approaching the climax of the choice between peaceful co-existence and destruction. The equal heights of Hope and Danger characterise the outlook of 1958.

DELIRIUM OF THE DINOSAURS

The military and political spokesmen of the West are for the moment dazed, bewildered, furious, sceptical, boastful, panicky, and breathing dire threats and imprecations. No doubt in the dim shadows of pre-history the once almighty dinosaurs and similar monsters that had held the earth in terror felt the same as their end approached and they had to give way to new conditions eventually leading to the emergence of the puny human race, whose strength lay, not in size and muscles, but in the use of tools and collective action. Are not all the material advantages, as the statisticians never tire of pointing out, the total output of steel three times the level of the other side, the accumulation of wealth and capital, the resources, the long political experience, on the side of the old world? And yet year by year the result goes the other way—China, Korea, Vietnam, Suez, Syria, soon Algeria and now the Sputniks. Why? Reason would suggest that the Western 'policies of strength', which have thus visibly failed, should be replaced by more intelligent policies. But the first outcry is sounded for more and stronger doses of the old policies, new and more costly weapons of destruction, 'crash programmes' regardless of expense, more bases extended throughout the world and the tightening up of sectional military alliances. Such is the Delirium of the Dinosaurs. They have failed to understand that the tests of evolution depend on more and deeper factors than the brute power of size and destructiveness.

LATE AWAKENING

Already the spokesmen of the West have been compelled to recognise that socialism has achieved superiority in science, technology, education and the rate of productive advance, and will soon, given peaceful conditions, achieve absolute superiority in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

productivity and living standards. The Rip Van Winkle *Economist* on December 7, 1957, stirred from its slumbers to admit that its previous complacent habit 'to dismiss Soviet claims of achievement in education as the boasts of propagandists' and the 'growing educational expenditure as a budgetary smokescreen' was mistaken blindness to the realities of the modern world. So now all the talk is that the West will 'overtake the lag'. In a couple of years, says Nixon. In ten years, says the more cautious spokesman of Eisenhower's scientific advisers. In a generation, says the still more cautious Professor Rabi in charge of the special enquiry on science and education.

THE LAG WILL GROW

But all these experts see only one side of the medal. They only see what can be proposed in paper plans on their side—without seeing that such a vast extension of education, and especially of really modern and all-round and scientific and technical education, cannot be achieved by the mere allocation of dollars like ordering a pound of cheese, but requires (Professor Rabi did to some extent recognise this) a profound transformation of the social structure to the classless character and equality of the sexes, making full use of the human potential, only achieved by socialism, and equally a transformation of the ideological outlook of society from the obscurantism and degradation of outlook of commercial class society. They fail to take into their calculation what will happen during the same years on the other side. They fail to understand that the same historical factors which brought about the lag, which in so short a time replaced the former extreme backwardness and inferiority by superiority, will continue to operate. The lag will not diminish. It will increase, so long as the difference of social systems continues.

'THE AMERICAN CENTURY 1941-1957'

In 1941 the American publisher, Henry R. Luce, proclaimed in a notorious and widely reproduced article the advent of 'The American Century'. The time had come, he declared,

> to accept wholeheartedly our duty and our opportunity as the most powerful and vital nation in the world, and in consequence to exert upon the world the full impact of our influence, for such purposes as we see fit, and by such means as we see fit.

Sardonically, the New York *Nation* adorned its issue of Novem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber 2, 1957, after the launching of the first Sputnik, with the cover frontispiece 'The American Century: 1941-1957'. Sixteen years. Just four years more than the twelve years of the 'Thousand Years Third Reich' of Hitler. The ambitions of the last offspring of bourgeois degeneracy outrun their capacities.

VOICES OF REASON

In face of the new conditions voices of reason have begun to sound from many and varied quarters. Even a General MacArthur and a General Bradley have warned against the bankruptcy of the strategy of nuclear war. In Western Germany Professor Hahn, the leading pioneer of German nuclear physics, and his fellow signatories of the Göttingen manifesto (unlike the Von Brauns and Nazi rocket scientists, taken over along with the Nazi Anti-Comintern slogans by the United States) have issued their warning and called for a world stand by nuclear scientists. The Reith lectures of Professor Kennan have provided a characteristic expression of partly new trends. As Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department nearly twelve years ago, he played a leading part in initiating the policy of military encirclement of the Soviet Union or so-called 'containment' and on this basis foretold the downfall of Soviet power in about a decade. He has now acknowledged the error of his previous estimates of Soviet developments, even though he does so only to fall into new errors. He recognises the necessity of a new approach, even though he still dismisses disarmament or a summit meeting, and has only begun to feel towards the first steps for an alternative policy on Germany and Europe. All these, and a thousand other signs, are symptoms of new trends in new quarters, appearing alongside the already proclaimed demands of all progressive sections in all countries, representing overwhelming majority opinion, for an end to the suicidal nuclear menace and arms deadlock and a turn to the path of negotiation in place of destruction.

VOICES OF UNREASON

But the dominant rulers and military leaders of the United States and Britain, and their associates in Western Europe, have not yet learned the lesson. They still cling to the bankrupt nuclear strategy, even after the dream of superiority has vanished, and even seek to intensify it. They still cling to unrealisable aims of dictating their terms to the world, as if the Western powers were still the natural

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rulers of the world. Thereby they maintain an international political situation of permanent strain and deadlock. They still refuse a representative Disarmament Committee, with equal representation of both sides, and insist on a packed Committee. They still oppose the representation in the United Nations of the largest nation in the world, for fear of weakening their gerrymandered majority voting machinery to conceal their real minority position. As late as July, 1957, a Report to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy could still proclaim the world policing role of the United States: 'History has laid on America for fulfilment in the world at large an international mandate'. As late as November, 1957, after the launching of both Sputniks, Secretary of State Dulles could still proclaim the aim of the Western military alliance 'to destroy this great monolithic structure' of the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly even the Editor of the *Sunday Express* found this declaration 'terrifying talk'.

MODEL OF GENGHIZ KHAN

As late as the summer of 1957 Field-Marshal Montgomery, not yet retired as Deputy Commander of N.A.T.O. forces, could write in the July, 1957, issue of the West German magazine *Aussenpolitik* an article on 'Warfare in the Nuclear Age', in which (emulating the notorious Colliers' magazine article depicting the American military occupation of Moscow in 1955) he offers an imaginative picture by a future historian of a war fought in 1966:

> On D + 20 it became perfectly clear that the core of the Eastern air force had been destroyed. On D + 25 the Eastern armies were practically without fuel and ammunition. Their losses were terrific. There were no major land operations after D + 30 and the Eastern naval forces, surface and underwater, were destroyed by D + 50. The war was over.

'There could be no question of taking prisoners', he continues in this charming pipe-dream of a war for the destruction of 'the East', since 'the object of ground operations in this nuclear age is not the capture of prisoners, but atomic destruction of enemy manpower'. The Western army 'must be in a position to achieve what has never before been achieved in history, with the sole exception of Genghiz Khan'. A revealing model for the Western 'champions of civilisation'.

Diseased fantasy? Yes. Insanity? Yes. But this kind of thinking still dominates in high places in the West. Therefore we have to deal with insanity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. *Strategic Mania*

A GENERAL awakening to imminent danger from the American bombers has spread through all sections of opinion in Britain during the most recent period. Why has this sudden awakening taken place after ten years of relatively passive toleration and even (on the part of all official expression of the ruling parties, churches, broadcasting, press, etc.) a servile acquiescence? Two factors have caused this sudden awakening. First, the information that since October, 1957, American planes loaded with H-bombs have been circling over Britain day and night, ready at a few minutes' notice to leave for appointed targets in the Soviet Union. Second, the knowledge, simultaneously made available, that the Soviet Union now possesses and is able to operate with precision the inter-continental ballistic missile and that, in the event of any such aggression from Britain, or rather, from American planes operating from Britain, the bases in Britain and, therefore, probably most of the island and its population will be destroyed in a few minutes. From this has followed the realisation that a single misinterpreted order or act of passion or madness by a single American pilot could destroy Britain.

'GREAT DETERRENT' IN REVERSE

Dr. Johnson used to say that 'when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully'. The prospect of the imminent destruction of Britain through the action of a single American bombing pilot has had a remarkable effect in beginning to concentrate the fitful attention of normally inactive sections of public opinion and pierce the fog of political scepticism or so-called 'apathy' (really, deep distrust of the entire ruling set-up). The so-called 'Great Deterrent' has begun to operate in the opposite direction to that intended by the war planners. So long as the question of the atom bomb was discussed almost entirely from the standpoint of the dispatching end rather than of the receiving end, a prolonged moral discussion ensued on the ethical desirability of using such means even for a good purpose; but the general picture that such a threat might be useful for keeping those troublesome Russians in order was accepted with relative equanimity by wide sections and by all official expression. But when it has become suddenly clear to all that the boot is on the other foot, that the assumption of nuclear superiority has been replaced by its reverse,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that any nuclear aggression by the United States (the supposed pledge of consultation with Britain is, as we shall see, worthless) is likely to result in the destruction of Britain, alarm has become universal. This general alarm incidentally reveals the unconscious realisation where the actual danger of aggression lies.

THE GREAT ILLUSION

Before the first world war the liberal pacifist Norman Angell wrote a book entitled 'The Great Illusion'. His initial thesis that the mounting armaments on either side were no real protection of the people was not incorrect; although his further thesis that in the conditions of modern international finance war could no longer be profitable to any nation betrayed the congenital liberal blindness to class realities that war and conquests by war can be highly profitable to sections of monopoly capital, although highly destructive and ruinous to the mass of the people. Today the argument has moved to a new plane. The Great Illusion today is the illusion of the 'Great Deterrent'—the theory that the possession of nuclear weapons can prevent major war by the threat of their use, or that the so-called 'nuclear stalemate' can be relied on to maintain 'peace by mutual terror'.

FALLACY OF THE 'GREAT DETERRENT'

The fallacy of the theory of the 'Great Deterrent' is both strategic and political. It was already a strategic fallacy in its initial one-sided form, when it rested on the illusion of nuclear superiority on one side to overawe the other. It is still more a strategic fallacy today in its modern form of the so-called 'nuclear stalemate' (now also becoming illusory in its assumption of nuclear equality) supposedly deterring both sides. The possession of nuclear arms on both sides, so far from preventing war, will only make it more deadly, if the political conditions lead to war.

FALLACY OF 'LIMITED WAR'

This menace is now rendered all the more grave by the modern Western official strategic theory of so-called 'limited war', advocating the use of 'tactical atomic weapons' (leaving Hiroshima in the shade for destructiveness) as supposedly 'legitimate' or 'virtually conventional weapons' in Eisenhower's phrase. For the margin between so-called 'tactical' and 'strategic' nuclear weapons is so imprecise and controversial in practice that the distinction is mainly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fiction to blind public opinion to the dread transition to the official adoption of the aim of nuclear war. It is obvious that in practice the initiation of nuclear war through 'tactical atomic weapons' could rapidly slide into major nuclear war. The millions destroyed by 'tactical atomic weapons' on supposed 'purely military targets' might fail to appreciate the fine distinction as to what had hit them, or that they were merely victims in a 'limited war'. (During the second world war also the fiction was long maintained that the strategic air bombing was directed to 'purely military targets'.) Nuclear war is nuclear war; and only the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons without exception can banish it.

MYTH OF 'DEFENCE'

But the fallacy of the 'Great Deterrent' is also political. For it is based on the assumption that the other side is the malevolent enemy hellbent on an armed assault on the peaceful little island of Britain or on Western Europe, and that the only purpose of all the vast armaments, bases, N.A.T.O., atomic weapons and hydrogen bombs is 'defence' against such a hypothetical assault. This little tale may be considered suitable to induce a weary population, groaning under heavy taxation, rearmament, inflation, American occupation and the rest of it, to accept their burdens with resigned acquiescence. But every military and political expert of every school has long ago dismissed this fantasy as a fiction. Professor Kennan has at any rate performed a service by reminding his hearers once again that the principal error of Western political strategy has been the fatal 'obsession' with the doctrine that the so-called 'Communist menace' is the menace of a Soviet military assault.

A PRACTICAL TEST

That this fiction is not even believed by its authors is proved by the present situation. For at the present moment it is admitted that the Soviet Union alone possesses and is able to deliver the inter-continental ballistic missile. Thus the Soviet rulers, if they so wished, could at any moment destroy the United States and Western Europe before there would be any possibility of the illusory 'great deterrent' of the bombers leaving their bases. Yet no one is in a panic over this situation. This theoretical possibility does not cause even the most nervous souls to sleep less soundly in their beds or listen anxiously for the sound of an explosion. All the panic is over the American bombers. Despite years of attempted indoctrina-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, public consciousness has a shrewder sense of realities, and of where the real danger lies, than all the official propaganda.

WHO ARE THE AGGRESSORS?

The living realities of the present international situation reveal a very different picture from the myth of arms for 'defence' or for 'deterrence'. Who are conducting wars at this moment? Only the Western powers. France conducts war in Algeria. Britain conducts war in Cyprus. Britain dispatches a warship and troops to Honduras in order to remove the Ministers chosen by the electoral verdict of the people. Holland appeals to N.A.T.O. against Indonesia, and sends a warship to West Irian (New Guinea). All this follows from the character of N.A.T.O. as the bloc of colony-owning powers, engaged in overseas aggression, masquerading as a bloc for the 'defence' of Western Europe. The internal contradictions between the European state members of N.A.T.O. (as over arms for Tunis) reflect this contradiction between their real character as imperialist states, each bent on mobilising the maximum resources for their own particular wars and aggressions, and their mythical character as a peaceful partnership or association for the 'defence' of Western Europe. But behind all as the decisive Power maintaining and dominating N.A.T.O. stands the United States, with its troops and bases in each N.A.T.O. country, and its Supreme Commander commanding the N.A.T.O. forces.

THE UNITED STATES AND N.A.T.O.

What does N.A.T.O. mean for the United States? For the United States N.A.T.O. in its military aspect is one of a series of military alliances or coalitions all over the world, organised and subsidised by the United States, for the purposes of an eventual or hypothetical war against the Soviet Union or socialist world. The bases in the N.A.T.O. countries, like the bases spread in other countries all over the world, are bases for use in the event of such a war. Under what conditions could such a war arise? We have seen that the United States still officially proclaims the aim, through the mouth of its Secretary of State only a few weeks ago, to 'destroy this great monolithic structure' of the Soviet Union. These are wild and whirling words, like the previous proclamation of the aim to 'roll back the frontier of Communism' and similar slogans. The bellicose utterances of all American political and military leaders are rather an indication of their wishful thinking than of a clear strategic plan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POINT OF DANGER

The main danger is not that the United States leaders would under present conditions be likely to embark deliberately on the gamble of full-scale nuclear war. This is not how world wars arise. World wars arise from the extension of local and regional conflicts when the world is divided into opposing armed camps. That is why the refusal of negotiation, of a summit meeting, of peaceful co-existence, and the insistence instead on the theory of 'massive retaliation', 'nuclear deterrents' and 'limited nuclear wars', leads inevitably to the ever present danger of major war arising from any one of a thousand particular incidents or moments of tension. The vast machine for launching nuclear war, with bases spread over the world, and with the H-bomb-loaded planes in the air day and night, stands ready to come into action at a moment's notice. Only, we are told, in the event of 'Soviet aggression'. But what is 'Soviet aggression'? Past experience has shown that any uprising of the people anywhere in the world, although not a single Soviet soldier has been moved, has been described as 'Soviet aggression'. Therefore any such local or regional development, any tense situation, without any question of military action by the Soviet Union, may give rise to a position when the United States Government may decide that the crisis calls for an immediate firm response, for a demonstration of strength, for the use of nuclear weapons (the Western powers refused the Stockholm appeal to pledge themselves not to use nuclear weapons first); the Strategic Air Command gives the orders, and the world is in flames. In these circumstances the British people may suddenly find themselves in the front line of nuclear war, as a main immediate target for destruction; and this danger is continuous so long as the American offensive bases are maintained in Britain.

ILLUSION OF 'CONSULTATION'

But has not Mr. Macmillan explicitly stated, like Earl Attlee before him, that the American Government has promised that no American planes 'based on Britain' will be used for nuclear war purposes without the consent of the British Government? Yes. The Prime Minister has offered this promise to appease the alarms of the British people, although it is noticeable that the affirmation of this pledge has so far always come, oddly enough, from the British Government, and never in corresponding explicit terms in any official statement from the American Government. But the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value of this promise is highly dubious. It is obvious that the conditions of military speed in a matter of minutes precludes any serious political consultation; 'the time factor does not allow consultations, except of the most cursory and urgent kind' (*Daily Telegraph*, September 29, 1957). It is equally evident that the use of bases outside Britain for the same purpose would involve the same consequences of general nuclear war, with the resulting inevitable involvement of Britain as a base and target, since there would be no label on the bomb, as Mr. Bevan aptly remarked in Parliament, to indicate from which American base in Western Europe it came. So long as Britain is one of a series of American bases, its fate cannot be separated from that of the other American bases in the event of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union.

A SIGNIFICANT LOOPHOLE

Indeed, there is reason to believe that the deception of the alleged promise of 'consultation' or 'veto', as so far announced, goes even deeper. Up to the present, both in the Attlee and Macmillan references to the pledge of consultation, the reference has always been made to American planes '*based on Britain*'. This formula refers only to the U.S. 3rd Air Force in Britain and not to the U.S. 7th Air Division in Britain, which operates directly under the Strategic Air Command H.Q. in the U.S. utilising British airfields, but technically not 'based on Britain'. Commander Young has shown this, when drawing on an article by the U.S. Commander of the 3rd Air Force in the U.S. *Air Forces Quarterly* of Winter, 1953. Hence the significance of the Premier's statement in Parliament on November 29 that, in the event of an accident to an American H-bomb-carrying plane, it would 'fly back to its base in America'—thus indicating that these H-bomb-carrying planes are not regarded as based on Britain. The planes ceaselessly flying over Britain with H-bombs are under the Strategic Air Command and would thus appear to be outside the scope of the pledge as so far announced.

> The Strategic Air Command is a highly mobile organisation, maintained in a state of instant readiness, and entirely under the control of the U.S. Government. It is independent of NATO countries in Western Europe.
>
> (*Daily Telegraph*, December 9, 1957.)

'NO VETO'—DULLES

Subsequent negotiations have been reported to be developing on this and other points. But one thing remains clear, whatever formulas are attempted to paper over the cracks and make a show

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of assurances for fuller political consultation. The United States Government has given emphatic and repeated notice that it will never forgo the absolute independence of operation of its Strategic Air Command, or permit any 'veto' by any nation:

> The United States would react through the Strategic Air Command if the situation seemed to call for it. There could be no question of a veto on the use of nuclear weapons being exercised by other countries. (Secretary of State Dulles, November 19, 1957, *The Times*, November 20, 1957.)

Hence those who seek to find reassurance in the pledge of consultation before Britain is destroyed by an American nuclear war are clinging to a very weak reed.

GUILTY MEN

In the event of such a nuclear war and the consequent destruction of Britain as the main American base in Europe, it is probable that the survivors, if any, in Britain would not recall with affection the political leaders of the past decade who led them to this outcome. Under these circumstances it is possible that Earl Attlee will be recalled, not as the Prime Minister who initiated a further extension of social services, nor even as the Prime Minister who withdrew the armed forces from India, but only as the Prime Minister who handed over Britain to the occupation of the American atom bombers. It must be assumed that Earl Attlee did not understand what he was doing, since the American official representatives were amazed (as the Vandenberg papers have revealed) at the light-heartedness with which the British Labour Ministers accepted a proposal that put Britain in the front line for destruction. The initial official announcement spoke only of 'temporary' visits of American planes for 'training' purposes; and, since no-one would wish to accuse such honourable gentlemen as Earl Attlee and the late Mr. Bevin of dishonesty, it must be assumed that they did not understand what was afoot.

FROM ATTLEE TO MACMILLAN

That was ten years ago. But what was surrendered by Earl Attlee in 1948 was only the beginning. What has been surrendered by Mr. Macmillan at Bermuda in 1957 goes very much further. For the Bermuda Agreement has surrendered to the United States demand to use Britain, not merely as a base for bomber planes, but as a base for American intermediary ballistic missiles. Not a single other West European country except Franco Spain had up to this time accepted such a proposition. Britain and Franco Spain were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be the two chosen exposed points for destruction. All questions of defence have here been abandoned. Britain becomes an American base for the offensive aim of launching missiles against the Soviet Union, even at the expense of the destruction of Britain. It has been expressly pointed out that the United States could not hope to reach the Soviet Union with its present range of missiles from its own territory, and therefore requires Britain for this purpose. Britain thus becomes, no longer merely the 'unsinkable aircraft carrier' for the United States, but an expendable rocket-launching site for a war of the United States against the Soviet Union. This is the destiny planned for Britain by the present Tory Ministers with the American Mothers. 'It is anti-British, but on balance it makes sense,' in the characteristic words of a contemporary Director of the Bank of England, as presented in evidence to the Leak Tribunal, and revealing in a flash the basically anti-national outlook of the Tory monopolist rulers of Britain.

3. *Unilateralism, Neutralism and Nuclear War*

IT is against this real background of the actual menace of the American Strategic Air Command operating in Britain, the American H-bomb-loaded planes flying over Britain, the American missiles to be launched from Britain, that the proposal—the no doubt well meant, but very confused proposal—of the 'unilateralists' to solve the problem by Britain ceasing to manufacture the hydrogen bomb is so hopelessly inadequate and irrelevant. So long as the American nuclear offensive bases remain in Britain, the cessation of manufacture of hydrogen bombs by Britain would not make one atom of difference to Britain's exposed position as the principal nuclear offensive base in Western Europe and therefore the principal target in an eventual nuclear war. The main danger to Britain arises, not primarily from the British H-bomb, but from the American H-bombs, bomber planes or missiles operating from Britain. To propose that Britain could 'contract out' by ending one without ending the other is to play with a serious question. Under such circumstances the idea of presenting the cessation of manufacture of H-bombs by Britain as a 'moral gesture of leadership' to the world would be more likely to be received with irreverent mockery by the rest of the world as a typical example of British hypocrisy to cover up a measure of economy, while remaining in fact the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principal Western nuclear offensive base. Indeed, Dulles also advocates that Britain should cease to manufacture the H-bomb. Dulles is also a 'unilateralist'.

NEUTRALISM VERSUS UNILATERALISM

Many supporters of unilateralism do also believe that Britain should get rid of the American bases and troops, withdraw from N.A.T.O. and the Anglo-American military alliance, and thus in reality abjure nuclear strategy. Much of the misunderstanding between sincere left supporters involved in the controversy arises from the confusion of these two very different things. Honest neutralism can be respected, *i.e.*, the proposal that Britain should follow the lead of India, withdraw from N.A.T.O. and military blocs, end the American bases in Britain and follow a policy of non-alignment. Such a policy would represent a great step forward for Britain from the present policy. But this is not what unilateralism proposes. Unilateralism is explicitly set out in the text of the Norwood resolution at the Labour Party Conference or the London Co-operative Society resolution. Unilateralism proposes that Britain should 'give a lead' to the world by ceasing to manufacture the H-bomb; but it does *not* propose that Britain should demand the withdrawal of the American bases and H-bomb stocks and bombing planes from Britain. This is an untenable proposition which could only mislead and confuse the real fight for peace.

CLEAR OUT THE AMERICAN BASES FROM BRITAIN

There is no doubt that under present conditions the speediest clearing out of the American occupation forces, H-bombs, bomber planes or missiles, and closing down of the bases, has become more than ever urgent for the future existence and survival of Britain. Everything must be done to strengthen the agitation for this demand. In particular, it is important to endeavour to win the support of the majority of the Labour Party for it, and to end the ten years of shameful acquiescence in the American military occupation of Britain and the acceptance of Britain's ignominious role as a subsidised and expendable American satellite. But the fact must be faced that this demand, however popular and corresponding to unorganised popular consciousness (probably far more than the unilateral nuclear disarmament demand, with its hint of pacifism), has not yet effective organised support beyond the more advanced left sections. It has not yet the support of either of the official ruling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parties. Public consciousness has still to be awakened to its urgency; although the American H-bombs circling ceaselessly overhead may help to speed this up.

THE FIGHT AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR

What already has majority support, what has the official support of the Labour Party by its last Conference decisions, and of innumerable other bodies and organs of opinion, is the demand for the immediate ending of tests and banning of all nuclear weapons of all Powers by international agreement. This aim is still opposed by the United States and British Governments. But the demand for it is so overwhelming as to be almost universal. All that is here lacking is not the majority support for this aim, but the active full-scale campaigning, with the Labour Party at the head, to make this majority will effective and compel its fulfilment. If the British Government could be forced to unite with the lead already given by the Soviet Government for this aim, then the undoubted support of all nations in the world for this aim against the resistance of the United States in isolation (and with strong support for the demand also among progressive circles within the United States) could compel its acceptance by the United States. Here, therefore, is the broadest united campaigning basis for the fight to end nuclear war. This needs to go hand in hand with the campaign for a Summit meeting—not the spurious 'Summit Meeting of Heads of State' of the Western powers in isolation to increase international tension and speed up the arms drive, but a real Summit meeting of East and West to ease international tension and prepare concrete steps for disarmament and peace.

December 12, 1957. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

THE HUNGER MARCH

When the National Hunger March was being organised, and while it was winding its triumphant way to London, the General Council of the Trades Union Congress warned local Trades Councils to boycott the March, and every mean despicable action possible was done to try and place obstacles and difficulties in the way of the Marchers.

Yet the March roused the whole country.

The Manœuvres of the T.U.C., by Harry Pollitt. January, 1933.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Case for Optimism

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

I HOLD the prospects of the peace struggle in 1958 to be good. They are good in spite of the present lunacy of endlessly growing armaments, of the day-and-night patrols of British-based U.S. aeroplanes carrying live nuclear bombs, and of the plans to set up more and more launching bases all over Europe for 'ballistic missiles'—in ordinary English, nuclear rockets—and in spite above all of the rejection of any and every offer to negotiate for a *détente*. In fact, the very intensity of the lunacy is a demonstration of the progress that the peace forces are making; if this were not so great, the 'brinkmen' would not be so hysterical.

But why, in the face of this lunacy, do I hold the prospects to be good? And am I not alarmed by the risk that some paranoiac high commander, some mistaken code message, or some misinformed or bewildered commander of a patrol, may bring about some irrevocable step to war?

I do regard the risk of the outbreak of an undesigned or unintended war as greater at the moment than that of the deliberate launching of a war; but this is largely because I think the danger of a deliberate war is now much smaller. And I think that at present even the most bellicose of Pentagon or State Department managers must be taking every precaution against the danger of an unintended war.

Let me state realistically my reasons for optimism, provided that it be vigilant. I start my reasoning on the basis that the U.S.S.R. has no intention of beginning war. I do not need to develop this point, which is conceded by nearly every anti-Soviet politician and commentator in both the U.S.A. and Great Britain, and is indeed the basis of much of the patent confusion of N.A.T.O. I only add, for myself, that the U.S.S.R. not only does not want war but is not in the least likely to be provoked or misguided into starting one. It is thus safe and correct to base our thinking on the thesis that whatever danger there is comes only from the 'brinkmen' at the head of the American ruling-class. The evidence that some of them actually want war, and that virtually all of them want to maintain the armaments race and the cold war which make war more likely to come, is again in need of no elaboration; it is provided both by their public statements and by their lunatic activities just described.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So, the answer to the question whether peace can be maintained is to be reached by analysing the forces operating on the minds of the 'brinkmen', whether in favour of peace or in favour of war, and of their reactions to those forces; and it will be safe to assume that, hysterical though they be, a substantial number is still able to estimate the strength of these forces, and act in response to them.

Let me consider these forces and their probable effects one by one. I take first the force of public opinion in Western Europe, above all in Britain itself, with which of course the rulers in Washington have to reckon. It is growing in strength, in clarity, and in anger. It started too slowly; it accepted, for example, the installation, under fraudulent misrepresentation, of an American army of occupation in this country, and the construction of air bases for U.S. bombers; for a time, it accepted as inevitable the appalling burden of the armaments race, and the ostentatious fixing of our arms budget by a foreign power; and it was very slow to see the direct connection between that burden and the long string of financial crises that bedevils its life. But it began to grow more restless when it realised that the bombers would soon carry nuclear bombs; it grew really angry when it learnt that bombers had in fact been cruising round over its head for many months, without any notice or warning, let alone consent, on a war basis, twenty-four hours a day, with nuclear weapons ready to be dropped. And it has now grown more angry still at the proposal that the Americans should have launching bases, for nuclear rockets directed against the U.S.S.R. constructed here, for which the British tax-payer will pay with his money while they are under construction, and with his life when they are finished.

This public opinion is sick and tired of armaments races, scares, tensions and crises. It is sick and tired of the 'American connection', and is beginning to hate not just the American ruling-class but the whole U.S.A. and all that therein is. It is once again swinging round to respect and admiration for the U.S.S.R. It hates war; it wants peace; and it believes that peace can be got and that its rulers are not trying to get it. More important still, it is itself now prepared to insist actively on its government taking steps to negotiate for peaceful co-existence.

This attitude of public opinion in Britain, pretty well paralleled in most of Western Europe, including Western Germany, until recently thought of as the modern mechanised equivalent of a seventeenth century mercenary, is a formidable force for Washington to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take into account. It compels the 'brinkmen' to realise that, if they seek to make war on the Soviet Union, they cannot count on co-operation from Britain or France, and probably not from Western Germany. (This does not mean, of course, that Britain and France would not be disastrously involved in war-like operations if the U.S.A. started it, for Britain in particular has been made into a target as surely as if she had been painted white, with black rings and a blob in the middle, and no one takes seriously the 'safeguard' that she would be rung up on the telephone from Washington before the war began, if Washington did not forget; but it does mean that Washington cannot hope for any real ally in the war.)

Nor is it only for that reason that the 'brinkmen' must regard their prospects of winning a war as small. In addition to the hopes of having allies at their side vanishing in this way, the new developments which they regard as necessary—the building of rocket sites all over Europe, the main topic of the N.A.T.O. meeting fixed to take place in Paris shortly after this article is written—is regarded by most of the countries invited to take part in thus qualifying their peoples for instant destruction at the outbreak of war, as unacceptable. This serves merely to emphasise to us that N.A.T.O. has in truth long been a ridiculous failure; most of its members welch on their obligations to maintain troops in Germany, finding 'better' uses for them in colonial wars; and its original dual purpose, of pretending to be a line of defence against a Soviet invasion which everyone knew and many confessed would never take place, whilst really designed for attacking the U.S.S.R., becomes increasingly unreal from month to month as military science developed. It even went so far, at one stage, as to try to justify its continued existence by pretending that it could usefully develop as an economic force! (It is as if Sandhurst, finding that infantry officers were rather out of date, should set up as a firm of chartered accountants.)

Its difficulties do not of course end there. Its notions of 'push-button' war, on which it spends hundreds of thousands of millions, and based its whole strategy for itself and its satellites, have not just dwindled; they have in effect been turned round 180 degrees; the buttons are in other hands, and the targets are American overseas bases and American home ports. The Sputnik is no weapon of war; but it is a quiet and cogent demonstration, by inference, that in any war that anyone starts Science will be on the side of the Really New World.

Then, Washington must also reckon that, at the very best from its point of view, any such war would bring incalculable devastation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to its own property and its own citizens; and it must reckon, too, that the various forms of political development towards popular power which it labels 'Communism' would advance by great strides in and after the war.

In short, they must reckon that the game is as good as lost. To-day, they cannot risk a war, for they cannot win it; it is too late even to accept the advice of some of their loud-mouthed extremists to start it at once because they might win if they start now but will certainly lose if they wait. They must renounce it, and they must take every step to see that it does not start by accident.

Those are the forces against war in America; what are the forces working in its favour? They are not small, but they are obviously not enough. The vast anti-Communist obsession that has been built up at a terrible price in human decency, freedom, and intelligence, cannot really be counted as a force for war; it can prepare the public mind for war, of course, but it cannot help the rulers to win a war; it is no more than a propaganda weapon, and is genuine only to the extent that its authors are genuinely terrified of the advance of the socialist world and of their own working-class.

The only forces still tending to support a war policy in the U.S.A. are two. Firstly, the fact that the ruling-class is determined to resist all socialist and working-class advances, if it can; secondly—and more important—the supposed need to maintain the armaments race, for the double purpose of enriching the powerful rulers of heavy industry and of postponing for a time the slump which has for years been held off to no small degree by arms expenditure.

These forces, I say, are not enough; they cannot outweigh the fact that the U.S.A. cannot hope to win a war. And everyone now realises that armament races—the futility of which was very well stated by Mr. George F. Kennan a few weeks ago, in his fourth Reith lecture—constitute no sort of defence or security, and are no more than a costly short-term means of putting off another kind of evil day; everyone who runs such a race knows that his racehorse is really a tiger, and that he will have to let go of its tail one day.

Thus, Washington is in a great and growing quandary; it must be asking itself. How do I get out of this? Today, in the growing hopelessness of its war policy and the increasing strength of resistance of its satellites, it cannot escape giving serious thought to the alternative. There is a practicable alternative: negotiation—sincere, and not sabotaged in advance by Dulles's orders—for peaceful co-existence. If it embarks on this and succeeds, as it can do, it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be out of many horrors, and the only loss it will suffer is that it will have to find some less wasteful work for its heavy industry, and abandon its witchhunt against 'World Communism' which it cannot in any case win. And just at this time, at what from a war-mongers' point of view is the worst possible moment, there comes one more offer from the U.S.S.R., for a summit meeting. Sooner or later, the situation will force Washington to accept, and really accept, such an offer. If it is stubborn enough to refuse this time, it will be faced by another, in a situation still more difficult for refusal. And so, peace will prevail.

I cannot end this article without examining two phenomena that are of great importance to Britain in particular and to peace in general. They are, first, the treasonable behaviour of the British ruling-class; and second, the increasing divergence between the will of the majority of the British people and the views expressed and advocated in Parliament.

On the first point, the facts are quite simply that ever since about 1947 our ruling-class has deliberately sacrificed one vital national interest after another, and one part after another of our sovereignty. We are economically enslaved to the American ruling class, which tells us what we must spend on 'defence', what we may spend on our social services, and with whom and in what commodities we may trade. It orders us to consent—in breach of all our treaties with the U.S.S.R.—to the rearmament of Western Germany, which means the re-establishment in their commands of Nazi leaders who ought to remain in the prisons out of which some of them were actually taken in order to enter on their new posts. We have lost the sovereign right to decide to be neutral in a war. We see our country occupied by foreign troops, who use our land at our expense, for purposes rendering it mathematically certain that we shall both be involved in any world war from the outset, and half destroyed at the outset; and our air is used in much the same way: with the horror-comic addition that the Prime Minister, when challenged about the dangers that will arise from accidents, finally has to confess that he is not even allowed to know, since the boss-country has passed an Act of Congress to tell itself it mustn't let him into the secret! Our armed forces are controlled by this foreign power, and would be commanded in the field by all sorts of foreigners, including Nazis, under the general management of Americans (who could not even defeat Korea). We cannot in general summon malefactors serving in the armies of occupation before our own courts, being thus subjected to 'capitulations' more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humiliating than those we used to impose on the 'lesser breeds' of our heyday. It is only a minor result that we grow poorer every day, and suffer from Bank rate shocks that give a few people the chance to sell their 'Gilts' (I always forget how to spell that word!) at a great profit, because 'it only makes sense' to prefer their private interests to the nation's good.

That utter humiliation is imposed on us by our rulers not because they are lunatics; they are sane, cold-blooded, only partly stupid people, who fear that unless they persuade us to spend the rest of our lives confronting Washington on our bellies, Washington won't help us to keep socialism out of Western Europe. For that, they are quite ready to sacrifice every bit of our sovereignty, our safety, our human dignity, and our traditions, to say nothing of our lives.

They are traitors, to us, to our country; but they are not traitors to their class. They are perfectly 'loyal' to what they put first in loyalty. If there was an O.M., an Order of Munich, they should all have it.

The second phenomenon is almost as serious. Whilst Parliamentary democracy, the two-party system, may not be good, it is at any rate better when it works according to its lights than when it doesn't. And, at the moment, it does not work at all. For its essence and its justification are that the divergent wishes of great masses of the population should be represented, and pressed forward, by one or other of the two main parties, so that in the long run every policy desired by a large number of the people will either prevail or at least be defeated by a majority after a 'fair hearing'. We are at present a long way even from the partial truth which is all that that ever was. Millions of us want negotiations for disarmament, peaceful co-existence, an end of American domination and occupation, an end of nuclear weapons and tests, and free opportunity to trade and make friends with the Socialist countries.

Those millions, if the system worked properly, would be represented by a Party in Parliament commanding somewhere between 55 per cent and 65 per cent of the votes and would achieve their object; but in truth they have been wholly unrepresented until quite lately, until—by the political 'wheelbarrow' principle, a wheelbarrow being something which goes as far as you push it—the Labour Party leaders began half-heartedly to support bits of it.

The lessons are clear; we can keep the peace if we fight hard. And as part of our hard fight, we must expel the Americans and the men of new Munich, and galvanise the Labour Party into representing what Labour voters in 1945 thought they would win.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where Do We Stand Now?

Councillor E. A. C. Roberts

BY-ELECTIONS fought during 1957 show a swing on the average of ten per cent against the Tories, but unfortunately the swing has not come to Labour. In fact, considerable apathy and confusion in the minds of the electorate has been displayed, as shown by the drop in the percentage voting and the increasing vote which the Liberals have been getting. This position must and can be changed by a vigorous campaign for the policies of the 1957 Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference.

In the November issue of *Labour Monthly* two Labour Party members posed two questions. Councillor Joan Maynard, J.P., asked: 'Where do we go from here?' Councillor John Lawrence asked: 'What next for the Left?' Before we attempt to answer these two important questions posed by my two Labour colleagues, let us assess what the position of the labour and trade union movement is now. This is best understood by examining the decisions and differences of the 1957 Trades Union Congress and Labour Party Conference, both of which I attended as an elected Amalgamated Engineering Union delegate.*

The last Trades Union Congress took a leftward turn, as shown in their decision on Wages and Economic Policy, which rejected 'the principle of wage restraint in any form, and re-affirms the determination of the trade union movement, while prices and profits remain uncontrolled, to take such steps, industrially, as will ensure that wages keep pace with rising costs'. On the forty-hour week, Congress placed on record its full support to affiliated unions in efforts to secure a shorter working week, with no loss of pay for their members, and to establish a working day and week for all manual workers of no more than eight hours per day, and forty hours per week.

The old age pensioners were supported in their fight for social justice by a demand upon the Government 'to make possible an immediate and substantial increase in the pension rates as now operating, to be followed by periodical reviews designed to ensure that their real value keeps pace with the cost of living'. On technical education, Congress declared 'that basic educational standards

*As many of our readers will know, Councillor E. A. C. Roberts is the newly elected Assistant General Secretary of the A.E.U.—Ed., L.M.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be raised by an increase in the number of comprehensive and technical schools'.

Congress attacked the Tory Government's proposals on local government finance, stating that the proposed 'block' grant policy 'is designed to restrict development in social services and to impose a heavier burden upon working class ratepayers'. On the Housing situation, Congress called upon the Government 'to alter its present policies, to reduce interest rates, to make capital more freely available to local authorities, and to re-establish the ratio between private and public housing that existed under the Labour Government'. The T.U.C. gave a good lead on the issue of the H-bomb, declaring that:

> their manufacture should cease immediately and that no further tests should take place. Congress calls on the General Council to press this policy with H.M. Government, which should be urged to propose with a view to agreement the immediate and unconditional suspension of tests to the Governments of other powers directly concerned, as a first step towards the banning of all nuclear weapons. At the same time, the I.C.F.T.U. should be requested to recommend similar action by all member trade union movements.

Congress determined its attitude on U.N.O. and China's inclusion by urging that 'the 600,000,000 people of China should without delay be invited to join and take part in the task of building world peace'. The vital issue of European security was considered, and Congress expressed 'grave concern at the dangers inherent in the present European situation. It considers that it is of extreme importance to establish a united Germany and believes that many of the present problems can be solved and the unification of Germany achieved and the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe effected by the establishment of a system of collective security involving all European countries and including the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.'

Congress debated public ownership, and drew the attention of the General Council to the fact that they had not carried out the decisions of the 1952 and 1953 Trades Union Congress on this subject. Therefore they instructed the General Council 'to work for the implementation of such policy in order that the trade union movement can determine the part it is to play in conjunction with the political wing of the Movement, in shaping Labour's next General Election programme'. It further resolved that 'the greater part of the machine tool industry should be brought under public ownership'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Mexico . . .

Two paintings by Diego Rivera

DIEGO RIVERA, great Mexican painter and fighter for peace, was born in 1886 and died on November 25, 1957.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These decisions set the pace and the pattern for the Labour Party Conference. This is a programme around which the labour and trade union movements could unite to defeat the employers and their Tory Government. The right wing gathered their forces to deflect this leftward swing at the Labour Party Conference, but they were only partly successful. The progressive and militant mood of the workers was reflected in the debates as well as in some of the decisions of the conference.

Whilst the E.C. document on *Industry and Society* was carried, this was only because many trade union delegations believed it to be in line with their own union's policy of nationalisation. For example, Brother W. Carron, President of the A.E.U., said that share buying was not to be an alternative to public ownership of industry. He also said that our union was 'convinced that certain sectors of the engineering industry, particularly machine tools and aircraft, must in the national interests be brought under public ownership in a very short space of time, unless we are to face grievous economic disabilities'. When workers are faced with an economic crisis, in their industry, they are prepared to put forward politico-economic solutions as was the case of the engineers in the motor industry about two years ago. They demanded the nationalisation of the motor industry. This demand is now the policy of the A.E.U. and is being campaigned for. A crisis due to a fall in the demand for machine tools and consequent shortage of work in the machine tool industry is making the demand for its nationalisation an urgent and necessary one for the nation. Similarly, this is the case in the deteriorating aircraft industry. Nationalisation versus share buying is not an academic matter, but one of vital economic concern to the nation. The workers see more and more clearly that nationalisation is not just a political slogan, but the only real solution to the problems created by competitive and monopoly capitalism. Brother F. Cousins at the Labour Party Conference stated sharply: 'I say to the Executive that you do not necessarily get socialism with nationalisation, but you do not get socialism without nationalisation'. Brother W. E. Jones, President of the N.U.M., said that the miners believe that 'there are the strongest ethical and economic reasons why we should maintain our policy of taking into national ownership and control all those industries which would benefit the nation'.

Britain needs a planned economy for a secure and expanding life for our people. The fall off in orders for manufactured goods in Britain is raising the demand for free world trade between East

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and West. This gives added point to the resolution carried at the recent Labour Party Conference on foreign affairs in which a clause called for 'an extension on international trade'.

The Labour Party Conference gave a good lead in the efforts to get a better standard of living for the old age pensioners in the resolution which demanded 'an immediate increase in the basic pension rates to £3, and desires the Parliamentary Labour Party to continue its pressure upon the Government to give this increase without delay'. Mr. R. H. S. Crossman, M.P., speaking on this subject of £3, said that the E.C. had come to the conclusion 'that we ought to be able to afford far more for the pensioner in 1957 than we could afford in the rationing and post-war austerity of 1946'. This increase would only cost the nation 10d. more on income tax. It could also be saved out of arms expenditure.

Progressive policies on disarmament and foreign affairs were decided at the Conference which would carry the Socialist movement forward, and gain support from the electorate—if campaigned for vigorously. These policies included:

(*a*) an end to H-Bomb tests; (*b*) a ban on nuclear weapons and the destruction of existing stocks with international control and inspection; (*c*) progressive disarmament with adequate supervision by the United Nations.

Points from the Resolution moved by the miners' president included:

the peaceful re-unification of Germany by a Five-Power agreement within the framework of a European Security Agreement; a European Security Pact as a means to reduce power tensions in Europe; the admission at once of the People's Republic of China to the Security Council as a necessary preliminary to the solution of Asian problems; general discussions with the leaders of the U.S.S.R., China and the People's Democracies.

These form the basis of a 'positive socialist foreign policy', which the movement should fight for now.

In order to give effect to the resolution which was proposed by the N.E.C. on the economic situation, our party should rally behind the demands of the trade unions for increased pay and shorter working hours. We should all be publicly campaigning on these issues, whether Members of Parliament or individual members of the party. We can then bring home to the electorate the truth of our statement in the resolution on the economic situation 'that there can be no effective solution to our economic problems while this Government remain in office'. The people of Britain are ready to accept a programme, clearly defined, which will lead to peace, security and freedom.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE COLONIES

H. B. LIM

DURING the past year the Labour Party has made more serious attempts to re-examine the colonial question. This has been shown by the publication of its three policy pamphlets (*Economic Aid, Plural Society* and *Smaller Territories*), by the increasing number of questions asked on the colonies in the House of Commons, and especially, by the continuing development of rank-and-file discussions and actions. The various shades of opinion in these discussions and actions reveal one potent fact, whatever the differences. It is, that Labour Party members are feeling and expressing growing dissatisfaction with both the Tory and right-wing Labour policies on the colonies. It is significant that the three policy pamphlets were adopted by the Labour Party at its last Conference as official policy, for they contain a number of policy statements and principles of action that have not been previously formulated and adopted. For example, the principle of the right of colonies to independence and self-determination was adopted; the exploitation of the colonial peoples and the domination of the 'White' settlers was generally admitted; and the need to assist the colonial peoples was repeatedly stated.

However, it is equally clear that neither the old guard of the right-wing Labour leadership nor the remnants of imperialist ideas among the membership have surrendered to the pressure of progressive changes within the Labour Party. The old influences can still be seen in the policy pamphlets and, for every progressive principle or statement adopted, one finds several interpretations and qualifications that hinder the application of progressive ideas and principles. Take, for instance, the principle of independence and self-determination for the colonies. What comprises independence? What must the Labour Party *do* in order really to help the colonies win their independence?

Obviously, the first and the most important thing to do is to help the colonial peoples remove the chains of colonialism. What are those chains? They are: military, political, and economic oppression, whether these be operated solely by British imperialism or in collaboration with American imperialism. But the policy pamphlets do not relate this *main* aspect of the problem to the principle of independence and self-determination. No mention is made of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that in the British colonies and protectorates—and even in Ghana and the Malayan Federation, which have gained state independence—a total of some 100,000 British forces are still in occupation, and in Cyprus, Malaya, Kenya, and Aden British forces are actually in action to keep down the independence movements of the people. Then again, British imperialism has been increasingly using N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O., and the Baghdad Pact to try and save the Empire, that is, to keep the colonial peoples down. What should be the Labour Party's stand on this?

There is no doubt what the answer would have been if the right-wing elements in the Labour Party had not supervened: recall the forces, dissociate from the imperialist war pacts and let the colonial peoples be free to determine their own form of government. Instead of this, the policy statement on the right of independence and self-determination is torpedoed from behind. Pleading (in *Plural Society*) that it is 'Britain's responsibility to ensure that this process (*i.e.*, of integration of the various nationalities) is fully carried out before British authority is withdrawn', the Labour Party policy statement is in fact pleading in favour of continued domination of the colonies by 'British authority'. What more could the Tories ask in justification of their continued military and political control over the colonies? Similarly, it could, and should be asked: If it is the intention to give the colonial peoples independence and self-determination, should they not be given a really democratic constitution and the complete freedom of vote? Yes, says the Labour Party's statement of general principle. No, says the *Plural Society* —at least, not yet! The Labour Party, says the latter, cannot be expected 'to establish the common roll immediately everywhere'.

Why not? The colonial peoples are demanding 'immediately' and 'everywhere' that they are ready for democratic elections. The Labour Party right-wingers try to explain in *Smaller Territories* that you cannot apply the principle of common roll and self-determination in Pitcairn or Tristan da Cunha. Why not? At any rate, Cyprus is not Pitcairn, nor are Malaya, Kenya, etc., Tristan da Cunha. Why have these major, advanced territories not been given the elementary means to express their will *freely*? Why instead, the continued policy of suppression, of disqualification of thousands of potential voters on allegedly 'subversive' grounds? At the time the Labour Party pamphlet was being prepared, not much was heard of British North Borneo's movement for self-government. Since then, the demand for self-government has been made—and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Tory Government's answer has been, as usual, suppression of 'subversive' elements. How long is this kind of thing to continue? It is time the Labour Party realised that even with the best intention in the world, it will continue to be used to shield the Tories' imperialist policy unless it supports in present practice the colonial peoples' demand for independence and self-determination.

The Labour Party recognises that poverty, disease, economic and social backwardness in the colonies are the heritage of 'imperial rule'. One hundred years of this rule has left the problem 'still to be resolved', says the pamphlet on *Economic Aid*. The extreme poverty of the colonial peoples is something which no words and figures can adequately describe. Their suffering is there for everyone to see, and it would take a cow-hide conscience not to be moved to shame and anger. But shame and anger are not enough. The root causes of this monumental act of imperialism's rank inhumanity have to be removed. But how? That is where the pamphlet on *Economic Aid* fails. It fails because although it assumes rightly that 'private investment . . . inevitably tends to look for high profits and quick returns', it imagines that this evil could be removed by a 'planned' and 'balanced' economy. This tendency to look on a 'planned' or 'balanced' economy as a virtue in itself without any regard as to who are to own the resources, who are to do the planning and how, is a serious weakness. Planning in itself will not exorcise the imperialist vested interests. That is why the Tories initiated and have to this day supported the Colonial Development and Welfare Plan (and its highly profitable planned projects in the colonies). Indeed, they are anxious to use it as an additional weapon of exploitation and domination. A total of 66 continuing projects were in operation in the colonies at the end of 1956 in which the Tory Government in 'planned' joint enterprise with such well-known 'private' investors as Unilever, Bookers & Greenheart (Demarara), Jardine, Matheson and Co., Ltd., Cadbury Brothers, the Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, Ltd. (to mention only a few), made a net operating profit of £371,718—an increase of *more than three times* the net profit for 1955 (£113,165).

It is more than ten years now since the alleged cure (of Government-planned investments) has been applied in the colonies. The result has been: deeper imperialist penetration, more profits and privileges for the 'planned' exploiters, further extortionate draining of the colonial peoples' resources, a wage-rate of 1s. 6d. to 7s. a day for the colonial workers, and the munificent sum of ½d. a week

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per person by way of welfare grant. Planning, not even the 'comprehensive local planning' as advocated by the pamphlet, cannot alter the fundamentally and predominantly imperialist character of the Colonial Development and Welfare 'aid'. The Labour Party must, to be consistent with its general policy statement of recognising the colonial people's independence and self-determination, support their demand for the right to control, develop and distribute their own resources. Any aid that is to go to them should be free from profit or other strings. The unwillingness to expose and remove the economic machinery of exploitation in the colonies is too painfully clear in the pamphlet. Hence, there is no mention of what Labour should do to the existing British private investments—among them the giants, Unilever, Dunlop, the Rhodesian Copper trusts—which gather their harvests of multi-million-£ profits every year. Not a word is said about the demands of the colonial peoples for the return of their sterling balances (which, with those of the Commonwealth countries, stood at £3,494 million in June, 1957).

The above are some of the key questions relating to the colonial question which many in the Labour Party have demanded to be thrashed out as part of the general discussion and policy statement on independence and self-determination. The failure of the Labour Party Conference to do this is not accidental. It is the outcome of the same right-wing influence which engineered the muddle and the retreat on the allied question of nationalisation in Britain. The old reformist plea of striking up a working understanding, even partnership, with monopoly capitalism 'at home' has once again revived illusions among the diehard right-wing section of the Labour Party that colonialism can be removed by 'improving the lot of the colonial peoples' or, to adapt the words of a well-known Indian statesman, by promising the colonial peoples that they will be fried in butter instead of margarine.

A great deal more needs to be done before the healthy pressure of rank and file members of the Labour movement—not least of all of the Communist Party—brings about a decisive change in the official policy of the Labour Party on the colonial question. It is already clear to many in the Labour movement (including the Labour Party) that this change would add a major impetus to the defeat of the Tories and to the removal of their disastrous home, foreign, and colonial policies. To do this, the brakes within the Labour movement itself (especially within the Labour Party) have to be removed and a clear, progressive policy adopted, without delay.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DANGER! WOMEN AT WORK

Angela Tuckett

LAST summer letters about the problems of women at work began to appear in the Labour Discussion Forum. For the most part, of course, the letters turned on the shockingly low level of women's wages. A study of this correspondence brings to light problems, some of which remain to be resolved, of importance to all workers. Below they have been summed up in the form of a dozen questions to which answers are invited.

In all, eleven full-length letters were printed, the first appearing in June. They included six engineers, a bus conductor, a scientist, and a catering worker. Seven were women and four were men.

Question One.

What *is* 'Women's Work'? asks Joyce Farrelly (engineer, October, 1957).

Question Two.

It is quite commonly argued that it is important in the interests of male workers that women and other lower paid workers should be organised, 'lest they are used as cheap labour to undercut us'. Is it true that the low level of women's wages in industry generally is already forcing all wages down?

Question Three.

Why is it that in an industrially advanced country like Britain women's wages are so low and there is an increasing differential? That equal pay is to be achieved first in the civil service, local government and the teaching profession?

Question Four.

Is it true that equal pay brings down wages ('ruins the job'); and therefore there is a conflict of interest between men and women workers which justifies the Women's National Schedule in engineering and the allocation of some jobs as 'Women's Work'?

Question Five.

A national minimum wage by law is demanded by the World Federation of Trade Unions. Is there a case for it in Britain?

Question Six.

Is part-time work a factor in depressing women's wages?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Question Seven.

Whose responsibility is it to take the first step to organise women? As seen by A. Saunders (engineer, July, 1957) women must join the union, be active and 'speak up' in shop and branch meetings to 'impress us with their desire to fight for the male labourer's rate'. Mrs. Doyle (engineer, August, 1957) says 'our trade union Brothers should take up this fight and provide leadership'.

Question Eight.

Where should a drive start? On the job? In the trade union branches? At national level?

Question Nine.

What special steps are needed to make women trade union conscious? Women's Conferences, more women organisers and women's advisory committees, changes in routine? More education among trade unionists?

Question Ten.

Trades councils have had a useful record in the past in assisting trade union organisation. Could they play a special role today in organising local information conferences about women's wages, and establishing strong advisory committees?

Question Eleven.

The main motive for automating processes under capitalism is to 'reduce labour costs': processes are not automated, as a rule, where wages are already low—as on work now typically performed by women. Hitherto, in discussing policy regarding automation, the trade unions have concentrated on the problem of protecting members displaced by automation during re-training and of re-settling them in new jobs. But automation means reclassification of jobs and inevitably a considerable increase in the proportion to the total labour force of the unskilled—those at present in low-paid, unautomated jobs together with those in the new re-classified jobs.

How is it possible, therefore, to frame a policy on automation without taking into consideration the present level of women's wages and organisation?

Question Twelve.

Are there any lessons the British Labour movement could usefully learn in regard to organising women workers and dealing with their problems, from experiences in other countries?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA TODAY and CHAUCER'S ENGLAND

Peking—Saturday, September 22, 1956

THIS morning Yü discussed suggestions for train journeys in China as well as a day's outing from this northern capital. Shall I go for the day to the caves at Chou Kou Tien, where the earliest kind of man was found some thirty years ago, *Sinanthropus Pekinensis*? Or to the Great Wall, nearly two thousand miles long and over two thousand years old—not that its giant size held back the Outer Barbarians any more than Hadrian's puny wall kept out us Picts? Or to the Grand Canal, wider than any of our British canals, and longer than Britain itself? (It was built 1,500 years ago when the night of Saxon, Angle and Jutish illiteracy and barbarism was closing down on Britain.) Or would I like first to go to a village? The last, I said, for every mighty work till now had been wrought by the peasants, like those I see each morning carrying away earth, in baskets slung at each end of a bamboo over their shoulders, from where the waters of the Young-ting River are this year to flow and fill the cisterns of this expanding capital. Besides these people have won such a shift in their way of life as never happened before at such a pace to any peasantry in the world.

Shenyang—Saturday, October 6, 1956

What happens when the peasants come to town could be seen when we got here today. This is Mukden (Shenyang). This town, famous in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05 and since, has now 2,080,000 inhabitants; has also 300 factories (half of them joint state-private enterprises) and 22 technical schools.

The Japanese occupied it in 1931: and after fourteen years it was liberated in 1945, by the Soviet armies. The Kuomintang were there in 1946 and it was again liberated, in November, 1948, by the People's Liberation Army. The Kuomintang in their brief period had largely destroyed, broken up or sold the machinery. The working class had been dispersed. Now the workers number 300,000. As yet skill was not high. The average age of the workers was 26 years and three-fifths of them were under 25 years of age. These raw recruits to industry were young peasants from the village. I gather that we shall see one of these villages of this North-East region on Monday. With such a high percentage of utterly un-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skilled there were bound to be many mistakes, and also, much bureaucracy. All this our hosts told to us.

Shenyang, Monday, October 8, 1956

I had been pretty exhausted by the N.E. region exhibition where everything was on show that seems to be made anywhere and I was looking forward to seeing the village, quiet village, this morning, and learn all about the Kaoliang, its giant straw and the soya bean stalks. But it was a downpour of rain. This had been going on all night and would have meant wading through mud. Our occupations had to be improvised. I was sorry not to have seen the village and yet had a slight sense of respite as I went through the familiar enough scenes of a cable factory, where copper is being drawn and spun and twisted. For tilling the soil, the most familiar of all occupations for thousands of years has become unfamiliar in its typical form to those who dwell in England—notwithstanding peasants in Wales and a fringe of crofters in the Highlands.

In England the peasantry were uprooted long ago: and it is far easier for a Spaniard or a Frenchman, let alone a Pole or a Russian to get a grasp of 'the agrarian question' in these lands of Asia. (Why, even the ex-landlord from Central or Eastern Europe who is given a teaching post in a British College has some glimmerings, in contrast with the native darkness of the ordinary home-fed and home-cured don.) But the Indians with whom I have been talking these days in the train understand the peasantry of China better still. In Russia in 1917 there were scattered islands of industry amid a sea of agriculture: an ocean of agriculture it was in India and China. If we could visualise ourselves back in Shakespeare's England, it would be easier to understand what India or China were like at the beginning of this century. No, it would have to be Chaucer's England; for the great agrarian shift or upheaval in the village had gone far in the 15th century and early 16th century.

Chaucer's England was not all Canterbury Tales (which were probably written to celebrate the great new nave at Canterbury as Verdi wrote *Aida* to celebrate the Canal at Suez), but also Plantagenet Kings with their endless wars, rebel peasantry led by Wat Tyler and John Ball, the cruel archbishop Sudbury executed on Tower Hill, the keen class feeling sparking from the verse:

When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?

Chaucer's England was the second half of the 14th century: Chaucer's China has been the first half of the 20th century. But

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the scale is greater, beyond comparison. For the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 led by John Ball, read the peasant risings from 1927 onwards, led by Mao Tse-tung, Chu-Teh and others of the Red Army: read the defeat of the Japanese invaders and their puppets from 1937 to 1945: read the defeat after three years' war of liberation of the Chiang Kai-shek gangs whose strings were pulled by Uncle Sam. In William Morris's *Dream of John Ball* the victorious peasant leader of Chaucer's day had unfolded to him all the changes there would be in England in the next five hundred years, and then of 'the change beyond the change'—the socialism which we have yet to see. In Chaucer's China, long before their victory of 1949, they were discussing the changes ahead. But all of these have taken altogether only some seven years—only a short section of the life of a single generation: from 1950 to 1952 the ending of landlordism; from then on to 1955 the successive stages of mutual aid teams and co-operative societies; in these last fifteen months *socialist transformation like a tidal wave* of 500,000,000 peasants.

This stupendous and awe-inspiring spectacle has been mostly ignored by the sages and scholars of Europe. Too busy with peering into the unchanging patterns of primitive societies? Or with resisting changes in their own? Their motto the three apes; See-no-good; Hear-no-good; Say-no-good.

A Village near Peking—Tuesday, November 6, 1956

Six miles or so from the city walls this morning we found the village on a side-road, which made it somewhat remote. Highways exist as yet only in small mileage. The village Chairman, in keen and alert middle age, with half a dozen others, welcomed us and brought us to a sort of grange with single-storey rooms. It was ten o'clock: but tea was brought in: and the boiling kettle was always on hand to replenish the cups—which was pleasant in an unheated room. They were very ready to answer all our questions: and, briefly, their answers (given by the Chairman, the party secretary, the organisers of the youth and of the women's federation) gave a vivid enough picture, in figures, of the change in their fortunes.

From small beginnings in mutual aid teams they went ahead till a bad flood in Spring, 1954, brought all together in common work of drainage, which in the end brought a better harvest: and 330 households joined together in Autumn, 1954. There were six co-operative production societies by 1955. With their better equipment they got better harvests than the remaining individual farms.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then this year practically all had joined the six societies, which themselves merged into one big co-operative society, fully socialist. Thus one of the 'stupendously grand thoughts' of Robert Owen, a co-operative production society, is realised on the fullest scale, just a hundred years after his death—but not in the country of his birth. Here are details they gave of their economy.

Crop	*Acreage (in mou)**	*Live Stock*	*Number*
Rice	5,773	Horses	28
Kaoliang, Wheat, Maize, etc. ..	2,722	Mules	68
Vegetables	401	Donkeys	77

*A mou is one-sixth of an acre.

They have also swine, ducks and other poultry and two cows: of the hundred carts many are hired out, with mules and mule-drivers, for construction work in the neighbourhood. They have 17 electric pumps and 47 other wells. In all, 1,297 households work 8,956 mou with a manpower of 1,948 and of a total population of 6,773.

When I asked about their organisation and administration, the Chairman gave the following details.

A regular quarterly meeting of 170 delegates, each chosen by their neighbours. An administrative committee of 15 which met fortnightly. One only was a woman. There was a director, six vice-directors (one of them the said woman) and eight members. These 15 operated in four sections: namely, finance; technique and production, with 20 teams: husbandry and transport; culture and politics. With each production team there would be a committee of five, in some cases seven. There was a separate supervisory group of nine, elected to see that the co-op. quarterly decisions were carried out. The society had also a few technicians and an accountant.

In addition we learned there was a supply-and-marketing co-operative society with its grocery and general store.

We now asked about the Communist Party. The Party secretary said that they had 158 members, of whom 57 were women, organised in six branches and 105 groups. Each branch has a committee of three or five or seven which meets weekly. The Party committee for the area consisted of a secretary, assistant secretary and nine others, meeting fortnightly. There were 207 members of the New Democratic Youth League. What was their main business? Their main business was output.

They had one big kindergarten and three group kindergartens set up by the co-operative welfare fund; and in them 54 children, 36 mothers and eight nurses. Two of the primary schools gave meals. O. then asked: 'what are the most difficult problems before

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you at the moment?' They mentioned four. The biggest problem was to improve the work stint: kaoliang was far too high, the rice stint was far too low. The second problem arose from argument about payments, the details of which we couldn't quite grasp. The third was the danger of floods which they were trying to overcome by 'changing the river bed', *i.e.*, by building dams and other measures. The fourth problem was that the cabbage crop had bolted: but they were very cheerful about their rice crop of 1,008 catties and a maize crop of 400 catties. How many were not in the co-op.? Only three households. One definitely opposed and two others whose attitude was still that of 'wait and see'. Before 1949, 80 per cent had been illiterate; now there was about 30 per cent who had still to learn. There was an evening school for adults where they managed to learn up to about 500 or 1,000 characters.

Then they said how pleased they were we had come to see them and we said how pleased we were to have come.

Then we walked through the main street which was a dirt track and entered the co-operative store. It seemed well stocked with clothing, bedding, grocery, dry goods, canned goods, ironmongery, basketry, ropes, stationery, etc.

We then swung south down a wynd, past several peasant's houses. At the last O. said she would like to go into it. O. was delighted to find in this two-roomed dwelling a kang with a cooking pot beside it. The housewife has two children and she proudly showed the medal she had received for her prowess as an outstanding member of what we understood to be the 'Society for Village Hygiene'.

Then we walked by the stream which everywhere is led off into ditches for irrigating the paddy-fields. We crossed it by a bridge of three stone slats, each 7 feet or so long and so on to the school house where we were surrounded by children and shook hands with the teacher. I noted that they taught the use of musical instruments such as the Chinese fiddle and flute, glanced through the little picture books and looked at some children's drawings, most of which were highly practical, *e.g.*, a 2-foot high apple and an 8-inch character beside it, all very pictorial. Then we went back to our transport where we took leave of our hosts. By this time it was a nipping and an eager air.

R. PAGE ARNOT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM

THE VALUE *of contributions to this column is shown by an article appearing on another page entitled* 'DANGER! WOMEN AT WORK'. *For it poses twelve questions prompted by a study of letters on Women's Wages, which started with one by Mrs. Silk in June, 1957, and ended with that by Mrs. Audrey Hunt in December. Clearly, it pays to air your problems in Labour Discussion Forum. In the current number there is a letter from an Angry Youth (not, apparently, a Cross Young Woman) whose complaint against this column, whether justified or not, certainly raises an important point which only our readers can answer:* 'DO YOU REALLY WANT THE YOUTH ON YOUR SIDE?' *Letters for publication in February should reach us by Monday, January 13; addressed to:* **The Editor, Labour Discussion Forum, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.**

Our Older Brothers and Sisters

The plight of the old age pensioner was vividly described by your correspondent 'Rebel' in the November L.M. He spoke for millions who, in the twilight of their lives, face hunger, extreme poverty, loneliness and other misfortunes which are the lot of those whose only crime is to grow old. That same crime awaits us all. It is only we in the active trade union movement who can bring pressure to bear to help our older brothers and sisters, if they are not to remain a depressed section of society. Frank Cousins, secretary of my own union, said in moving the resolution on pensions at the Trades Union Congress on September 3, 1957: 'It is right that those who have helped us to create so much should have the opportunity to enjoy some of the privileges'. Their claims have to be 'pressed in a manner which makes this Government understand that we mean them, in the same way as we mean our other opinions'. He went on: 'We must continue to say that we through wages demands shall increase our standard of living, and that the old age pensioners through Government action need an increase in theirs'.

Dead right, so far as it goes. It is good to pass resolutions at the T.U.C. and in our trade union annual conferences. But only the whole movement, roused into angry action from top to bottom, will end what the T.U.C. resolution rightly called 'a national scandal'. The recent pension increases by the Tory Government are mean enough; but it is even worse that these increases should be derived from increased contributions. Millions of pounds could easily be available if the horrifying and unnecessary 'defence' programme were cut. Our old people deserve the best: H-bombs and guided missiles are worse than useless.

I am secretary of the Old Age Pensioners-Trade Unionists Joint Committee of our trades council; and the committee have requested me to write to you so that what we have done may reach your readers. We feel the rest of the labour movement should know what we are doing in Willes-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

den with our forces united. Here, in one of the largest boroughs, both in population and in rateable value, we have 20,000 pensioners, or one in every nine inhabitants. Of these 10,000 are over seventy years of age. On October 21 last the Willesden Trades Council and the O.A.P. organisations formed a committee to lead the campaign to show Willesden people the shocking plight of our old folk. We realise that there are those who hate the idea of the power of the trade union movement being put behind the pensioners' demands. Well, they will just have to get used to the idea and learn to bear it.

All through the winter our factory gate meetings are continuing. We are keeping up a propaganda blast with leaflets and speakers going to meetings of other bodies. When brighter days return we shall intensify our campaign and organise mass rallies and lobby Members of Parliament and local authorities. We accept all forms of assistance, from money for our funds to ideas on how best to carry on the fight—and very welcome and helpful these are proving. Indeed, that is one reason we are writing to you; for we ought to pool our ideas and new methods with the rest of the labour movement. We should like to benefit from the experiences of what others have done.

STAN BURROWS,
T. & G.W.U. *Willesden.*

'Do You Really Want Youth on Your Side?'

I have followed your letters from when they began, over a year ago. Some have been interesting and lively. As for others—well, just how square is an egg? Then I read the Index carefully. It shows one—just one—article on 'Youth at Work' and seven letters out of a total of 78 'on Youth Problems'. It seems to me, that to get a letter published in L.M. it has to be written by a Tenant, a Wage-Earning Woman or an Old Age Pensioner. Do you really *want* the youth on your side?*

A. B. BUTLER,
(Aged 18.) *Middlesborough.*

★ (*Do we want youth on our side? We do, indeed! Write and tell us what you think your problems are, what sort of support you expect. What about a letter on 'What's Wrong with Our Elders?'*)

'Women? Second Class Citizens'

It's a little humiliating for British women who fought the great fight for women's rights before the first world war to realise that the Russian women have had equal pay and the rate for the job for forty years; that their women are playing an equal role in the development of the sputniks, while we who have always regarded ourselves as the advanced women of the world have hardly got to first base.

Women civil servants will come into their own in 1961. My union, the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union, got agreement in 1949 for clerks in civil aviation, but for the nationalised industries we shall not have equal pay till 1960 and 1961. But these, though the result of a long and uphill fight, only touch the problem. The engineering employers are adamant on this: they not only won't give equal pay to women engineering clerks. They think that that is right and proper. For the big engineering bosses, women over eighteen years of age are not fitted to receive the same rates as men; and in almost all the big combines it is rare to find a woman even a section head, let alone head of a department. But this is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not all. Married women have added disadvantages: the old Anomalies Act, brought in when there was mass unemployment by which married women are cut off benefit after being unemployed a short period, is still in force. Its clauses are incorporated in the National Insurance Act brought in by the Labour Government in 1948. Though paying the same contribution as single women, when sick we receive less money. Why? Because, I suppose, our husbands slave to keep us in comfort, not to say luxury; and we only go out to work to buy make-up and the like. Thereby, just as we used to keep coals in the bath, we neglect husbands, home and children.

All these myths are sedulously generated by the very class who pay us our wages. But why should we fall for them? Why do we permit ourselves after all this time to be treated as second class citizens, classified with lunatics and infants? We pay the same taxes; houses are not cheaper for us; the butcher does not take sixpence off for us; we pay the same for dinner in the canteen (if it's eatable), and for our cups of tea.

It is a long established and deep-seated prejudice which, instilled over the years, has blinded even working men and working women. I know girls I have worked with who say: 'Oh, well, you can't expect it, can you?' To which I replied: 'I not only can but do—what about joining the union?' They will answer: 'Oh! *you*!'—or on occasion: 'Yes, I will! and that surprises you doesn't it?'

OLIVE ARNOT.
London, N.W.1.

Hell Overhead

Official sources have now confirmed that the British people live under the constant shadow not merely of destruction in a nuclear war, but of devastation in peacetime! American aircraft equipped with H weapons, patrol our land constantly overhead.

The Suez crisis, succeeded by the Trafalgar demonstrations, revealed the potential power of the Labour movement at its most inspiring. The present situation is probably even nearer disaster. And the reaction to date of the Labour Party? Apart from the vigour and genuine concern exhibited by some M.P.s, it is almost negligible.

If ever the full power of the working-class movement was needed to deter the H-bomb maniacs, this is the time. Let us all do our utmost to rouse everyone to this hellish peril.

ALAN R. BENNETT,
(Aged 19.) *Poole.*

A Peaceful Geophysical Year

Ever since November, 1917, it has been the aim of the Soviet State to live at peace with all other countries, no matter what their social order. Today we have a splendid example of the possibility of peaceful co-existence in the working of the International Geophysical Year, in which scientists of fifty-four countries unite, including those whose Governments persistently show their hatred of Russia and voice threats against her. In *Once Round the Sun* Ronald Frazer gives an account of the International Geophysical Year, how it came into being, its purpose, its tasks and possibilities. He not only outlines the above points in a really exciting manner, but draws attention to the way in which all the fifty-four nations taking part are working in the completest harmony in accordance with the plan.

On the use of rockets, or satellites, for direct scientific exploration of the upper atmosphere, he points out

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that this is in accordance with the recommendations of the International Geophysical Year Council at Rome in 1954. He comments on the first such rocket launched from White Sands, New Mexico, U.S.A., on April 16, 1946, carrying instruments for the observation of man's environment, instead of high explosives, 'You could say that here the sword had been beaten into a ploughshare'. But, as he remarks, 'almost every scientific discovery is a two-edged sword, and you can't blame God if man insists on honing the wrong edge'. The I.G.Y. has no military edge. The same can be said of the two satellites sent up by the U.S.S.R. for direct observation of the sun, cosmic rays, etc., from the outside the belt of the upper atmosphere.

What is to be gained from this united piece of exploration, apart from new information? That so many different countries are banded together in a common task is sufficient justification, he asserts; adding that 'to anyone who has seen the whole development of the enterprise from its modest beginning in 1950, one of the most shining facets has been the practical demonstration that given a certain attainable threshold of mutual interest, men of all nations are willing, nay eager, to join in a drive towards the same goal'.

Surely, one may comment, the provision of food, clothing, shelter, education—in a word, a full life for all is today a matter of the highest mutual interest on which man can unite for the welfare of all.

J. A. SMITH,
Brighton.

Zionism and Refugees

Can we not have a little more intellectual honesty about Zionism? Without the alliance with British imperialism the possibility of large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine simply would not have existed; firstly because the Arabs would not have permitted it: and secondly because without land purchase and capital investment the immigrants could not have hoped to maintain themselves, being mostly without means. A Socialist Palestine could have absorbed these people without harm to the existing population; under the prevailing system of private land ownership, with rich Arabs selling land, some dispossession was almost certain to take place. Should Jews then have refused to enter Palestine under these historical conditions? Dutt gives the impression that they should. Where then should they have gone? Or doesn't this matter? The truth is that Zionism did become the instrument through which hundreds of thousands of Jews escaped massacre. Why is it so difficult for anti-Zionists to admit what the whole world knows to be true?

At the United Nations Gromyko said that the idea of a Jewish State had taken hold of the Jewish masses because the European peoples had failed in their duty to guarantee to the Jews the most elementary right, the right to live. Could a more serious indictment be brought against anyone? Let us cease to be hypocritical. Whatever other factors may have entered into the birth of Zionism, the food which gave it strength to grow was bloody pogroms, culminating in the Nazi massacres. Is it not time that the European working class accepted at least some responsibility for the tragic events in Palestine, instead of placing the entire blame on the Zionists?

VERA GREY,
Enfield.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DIARY OF A SPUTNIK

"Dogwatch" logs the first 4 weeks of Sputnik II

Here are some extracts from a diary of the first four weeks of the life of Sputnik II, successfully launched by the Soviet Union as a part of the International Geophysical Year programme on the eve of the Fortieth Anniversary of the October Revolution. Their pilot satellite, Sputnik I, weighing 184 lbs., was launched at the first attempt just one month before. It orbited 500 miles up, circling the earth in 95 minutes. Vital statistics of Sputnik II are: Weight, 1,118 lbs. Speed, 5 miles a second. Orbit maximum height, 1,056 miles up. Contents, two radio transmitters; instruments for measuring cosmic rays, temperature, pressure; and a sealed, air-conditioned kennel, with food and drink, and one of the Soviet space dogs, Laika. Weight of launching rocket, about 500 tons. Announcement: about 6 a.m. G.M.T., November 3, 1957.

Sunday, November 3, 1957. The first living being is launched into space by Soviet scientists and is orbiting round the globe in 103 minutes. Sputnik II is over half a ton, the weight of a baby car.

'Dramatic and spectacular demonstration of Russian achievement.' 'It pays to take notice of what the Russians say they are going to do.' (Professor A. S. B. Lovell, Jodrell Bank Observatory.)

'An achievement six times as great as the first launching.' (Mr. Fred Whipple, Director, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Massachusetts.)

'Even more exciting news than the launching of the first satellite.' (Admiral Sir Archibald Day, British Co-ordinator, I.G.Y., Brussels.)

'Such acts put the scientists outside the pale of decent peoples. . . .' The United Nations should 'outlaw such foul experiments and those who perpetrate them.' (The League Against Cruel Sports, London.)

Monday, November 4. Academician Dikushin states that new sources of power were used and a multi stage rocket of new design.

The Hearst press demands that President Eisenhower appoint 'a Missiles Czar'.

Mr. Lester Pearson (Canada) says the Western Alliance faces 'Soul-searching re-appraisal of its resources and strategy.'

Tuesday, November 5. U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee decides on a full-scale Senate enquiry into the Missiles and Satellite Programmes. Senator Symington (Democrat) said 'The U.S. is at least two years behind,' the first launching was a 'technological Pearl Harbour'. 'I am sure the U.S. can catch up with Russia but missile and rocket programmes are being reviewed. It will be desirable to provide continental allies with a list of missiles' (Mr. Foster Dulles).

'Never has the threat of Russian Soviet Communism been so great or the need for the Western countries to organise against it been so urgent' (Mr. Harold Macmillan.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wednesday, November 6. Proposing a Summit Meeting, Mr. Khrushchov says the Soviet Sputniks are 'waiting to be joined by American and other Sputniks to form a commonwealth of Sputniks', which will be 'much better than an armaments race'.

Thursday, November 7. In the House of Lords, Lord Attlee says if the Americans are shocked by the fact that the Russians were ahead of them it is largely their own fault because of the McMahon Act. It will be all to the good if the U.S. realises the interdependence of free peoples. Lord Gosford, Foreign Under Secretary, replies that the Government are not willing to 'weaken our nuclear deterrent': Mr. Khrushchov's words must be matched by deeds.

President Eisenhower broadcasts on TV. 'Our scientists assure me that we are well ahead of the Soviets in the nuclear field both in quality and in quantity'.

Dr. Paul Foote, Assistant Defence Secretary in charge of research, says the U.S. has fallen four or five years behind in missile development and it is going to be hard to catch up.

Friday, November 8. Britain explodes an H-bomb at high altitude near Christmas Island.

The U.S. Defence Department orders the army to go all out with a 'crash programme' to launch an earth satellite. President Eisenhower dedicates a new building of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission 'designed to protect the country's nuclear secrets against nuclear blasts, spying and saboteurs.'

The Supreme Soviet calls on all peoples of the world to secure the reduction of armed forces and armaments and the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons and an agreement for immediate end to atomic and H-weapon tests.

Saturday, November 9. Moscow Radio announces that the work of the radio transmitters inside the satellite has now been 'completed in accordance with the planned tasks'.

Monday, November 11. A Report by the U.S. Office of Education states that the average Soviet school student is two years ahead of the American student in all academic subjects and in general science three or four.

President Bulganin says two American young women have written asking for places to be reserved on the first moon rocket.

Tuesday, November 12. General Thomas S. Power tells the NATO conference that planes armed with H-bombs are constantly overhead, day and night, all over the world.

At the Church Assembly Lord Alastair Graham said the church should send up a Sputnik with a bishop inside to draw the attention of millions towards God.

Thursday, November 14. NATO Secretary-General Spaak (Belgian Socialist) says the Russians have scored a great scientific success with the Sputnik to the detriment of the Russian people themselves. 'We in the Western world must have both the Sputnik and the washing machine'.

Friday, November 15. In a press interview with B.U.P. correspondent Shapiro, Mr. Khrushchov challenges the Americans to 'a peaceful rocket contest, just like a rifle shooting match'.

Sunday, November 17. In a radio interview U.S. Senator Butler (Republican) says 'I would like to see our armed forces shoot down Sputnik II. I think it is possible of accomplishment. We just say to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them 'you put them up and we'll shoot them down'. I think we will come to that some day and it is not too far off'.

Friday, November 22. A U.S. Air Force spokesman says that America fired 'artificial aluminium pellets into space last October'.

Monday, November 25. Tass states that the first rocket should enter the earth's atmosphere during the first ten days of December.

NATO Chief of Staff, General Schuyler, says the West would be able to hit the Soviet Union from missile launching sites in Britain before the Russians' inter-continental ballistic missile could be operational: Sputniks represent 'no revolution in military thinking'.

Dr. Edward Teller gives evidence to the Senate Preparedness sub-Committee. 'Russia has caught up with us not because they stole our secrets but because they worked hard'. He never believed that Russia owed her scientific advances to captured scientists: the Sputnik shows they are very far ahead in rocket development.

Saturday, November 30. Sir Alexander Fleck, I.C.I. chairman, says the Sputnik is a direct challenge to British manufacturing skill and know-how: it would be churlish and foolish to underestimate the achievement. Sir Cyril Hinshelwood, President of the Royal Society, says 'Top People' in Britain treat science as beneath their dignity. At Harwell they are reduced to buying second-hand test-tubes from laboratories closed through shortage of science teachers.

Moscow announces detailed plans for an atomic aircraft, from which further super-sputniks could be launched.

Sunday, December 1. Reports to the U.S. Office of Naval Research state that 'a glowing object' fell in the Fort Greely military reservation, Alaska. Professor Lovell announces the rocket of the first sputnik cannot be traced and must now be down.

The U.S. Air Force will launch a satellite by Vanguard rocket on Wednesday from Cape Canaveral, Florida, so as to be in orbit during the NATO conference this month, at which demands are expected for some Powers to be allowed to share the U.S. nuclear 'know-how'.

Tuesday, December 3. The first launching of the first U.S satellite is 'expected tomorrow in Florida, weather permitting'. It will be the size of a grapefruit and weigh 3¼ lb.

Wednesday, December 4. The U.S. Vanguard is delayed twice today.

Thursday, December 5. The Vanguard launching is again postponed.

The Soviet Union launches the first atomic ice-breaker—44,000 h.p.

Friday, December 6. At a Finnish Embassy reception in Moscow Mr. Khrushchov says the Soviet Union is ready to withdraw troops from East Germany if NATO will withdraw from West Germany. He adds that the rocket of Sputnik I has fallen on U.S. territory, but the Americans have not returned it.

The Vanguard rocket explodes on its launching stand.

'It is one of the best publicised and most humiliating failures in history' (Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democrat).

'That's too bad.' (Arkady Sobolev, Soviet Ambassador in U.S.A.)

Saturday, December 7. Former Defence Secretary for Research and Development Dr. Clifford C. Furnas says failure is due to 'being a little too frantic about the programme.'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

HOW TO CATCH UP WITH SOCIALISM

Technical Education in the U.S.S.R.
C. E. Simmonds
Society for Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R. 1957. 36 pp. 2s. 6d.

MISS SIMMONDS has prepared a useful pamphlet on a subject which is now being widely discussed. Technical education is one of the essential links in the equipment of a people which wishes to possess a high standard of living. Abundance of goods for all can be provided only by the most competent development and use of the means of production, and this requires that science and technology should be improved continuously, and applied to the productive processes. 'To each according to his needs, from each according to his abilities' can be realised only through the utmost increase and use of scientific and technical knowledge.

Miss Simmonds has described how the Soviet Union has organised its technical education system, especially since the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan, when it became absolutely essential to develop it with extreme rapidity. At first, there was a concentration of effort on short specialist courses. After these had produced a large number of useful but narrowly trained engineers, more attention was given to preliminary technical education. At the same time, the basic elementary and secondary education was extended on a universal scale, so that the whole population became literate. After the early Five-Year Plans had accomplished their aim of creating the foundation of a modern industry and with it a vast range of scientists and engineers of every speciality, a policy of raising the quality of education was pursued, especially after the Second World War. The education in every direction, including technical education, became deep as well as vast. Its fruits are now becoming evident in the spectacular launchings of the first artificial satellites, which have not only equalled, but quite surpassed, all previous achievements in this line of development. Many more achievements of the same magnitude in other branches of science and technology are to be expected.

Miss Simmonds' account would have been strengthened if she had given more attention to the ideological origin of the development. It springs directly from Marx's comment in Volume 1 of *Capital*, where he says in his chapter on Machinery and Modern Industry: 'From the Factory system budded, as Robert Owen has shown us in detail, the germ of the education of the future, an education that will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings'. Lenin quoted this passage as the inspiration for his recommendations on technical education, and it formed the text from which the Director of Higher Technical Education in the U.S.S.R. actually worked, at the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan in 1929. The fact that Soviet technical education, through Lenin and Marx, owes a debt to Robert Owen should give some satisfaction to British socialists.

It is rather pathetic that in some progressive circles in Britain Soviet technical education, together with science and technology, was not appreciated until it had been made

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fashionable by Sir Winston Churchill. Facts, such as Miss Simmonds has assembled, are essential and valuable; but they would be still more valuable and instructive if the ideological equipment which enabled the Soviet Union to conceive and carry out the development were more fully described and explained.

J. G. CROWTHER.

EXASPERATING ESSAYS

Exercises in the Dialectical Method. D. D. Kosambi. *People's Book House, Poona,* 2 rupees.

Professor Kosambi appears to have chosen his provocative label in the hope that his writings may prove exasperating to 'the intellectual bigots of the Right and the Left'. They are intended, he says, 'to stimulate the thought processes of those who look for valid answers to pertinent questions of social interest'. He writes as a would-be Marxist, brought up in Washington, not unacquainted with U.S.S.R. and China, and an active stalwart of the World Peace Movement. Those who have ever argued with him on any of his chosen specialities, which include mathematics, numismatics, statistics, genetics, path-geometry, indology, history, the literatures of several languages in Europe and Asia and amateur politico-economic analysis (as well as anything else) will not be surprised to hear that these hundred pages—scattered over the period 1939 to 1957—well live up to their proclaimed purpose. He has lively views on the development, present role and future prospects of the bourgeoisie in India, and on a problem I have not seen elsewhere confronted, the reasons for the fading away of Buddhism in its country of origin. Two particularly plausible and fascinating essays discuss the class forces expressed in the trial of Socrates and the social background of early India to be deduced from the work of the Sanskrit poet Bhartrihari. The meaning for India of the Chinese revolution, the significance of the 1857 Revolt, and more general titles such as the Function of Leadership in a Mass Movement, Science and Freedom, Imperialism and Peace complete the subjects he tackles on his teasing venture.

IVOR MONTAGU.

GEMS FROM CHARTISM

An Anthology of Chartist Literature. Edited by Y. V. Kovalev, *Foreign Languages Publishing House of U.S.S.R.* 414 pp. *Central Books Ltd.* 10s. 6d.

THE Russians have done more than put the *Sputniks* round the world; they have brought to light, in a way never done before, the role of the Chartists and that great character Ernest Jones in the great struggle of the working people of Britain. It has long been a slur that no one in recent times in the labour movement had thought to bring to the knowledge of the present generation the fire and spirit of revolt engendered by the Chartists and Jones in their great struggle. What John Saville did was confined to Jones himself. This book goes far wider in that it has brought together in one volume a whole series of leaders and people of the Chartist movement which was in danger of being buried and forgotten, 'lost in the archives'. The Russians have not gone into polemics on the matter. They have done much better. They have produced 116 poems of various Chartists printed in the *Northern Star* and other papers; and in addition 31 gems by Ernest Jones himself, many quite

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new to present day readers. There are extracts from novels by Chartists, literary criticisms and much more—all in 414 pages for the small cost of 10s. 6d. It is a 'must' for all who want to know about the beginnings of the British Labour Movement. It shows us how Chartists fought and beat the bell-ringing and bookmaker Tories of their day, and gives hope and encouragement for us to do even better to smash this gang of bloodsuckers and make Britain a better and healthier place to live in. They did. And so can we.

FRANK JACKSON.

Soviet Industry and Foreign Trade. F. Koort.
Soviet News. 88 pp. 6d.

Sputniks, and other evidence of Soviet scientific and technological developments, are now talking points among thousands of British workers. This is not surprising, since whatever else is said about the British working man, no one denies that he recognises and admires skill when he sees it. Soviet industrial and economic advance must by its nature rest on the possession of a fundamental engineering know-how, particularly of the machine-tool industry. Our technicians admit this, but the general public really knows little how it is done; how the Russians plan: how they gain and spread knowledge. A new handy little booklet, published in the Soviet News series, tells the layman many of the things he wants to know. Its title is *Soviet Industry and Foreign Trade.* It costs a humble tanner.

GEORGE SINFIELD.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Political Economy: Textbook of the Institute of Economics of The Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Lawrence & Wishart. 858 pp. 21s.
Philosophy in Revolution, by Howard Selsam. Lawrence & Wishart. 160 pp. 21s.
The Unservile State, edited by George Watson. George Allen & Unwin. 316 pp. 21s.
Lenin on Trade Unions and Revolution, 1893-1917, by Thomas Taylor Hammond. Columbia University Press, Oxford University Press. 155 pp. 28s.
Truth is a Naked Lady, by Jack Beeching. Myriad Press. 32 pp. 2s.
My Country, by Helen Fullerton. Lawrence & Wishart. 48 pp. 3s. 6d.
The First Labour Government R. W. Lyman. Chapman & Hall, Ltd. 302 pp. 25s.
Decision in Africa. W. Alphaeus Hunton International Publishers, N.Y. 256 pp. $4.00.

REVISED ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

IN THE UNITED KINGDOM (post-free):

If by wrapper	18*s.*
If by envelope	£1

OVERSEAS (post-free):

Second class mail (unsealed envelope)	
Canada and U.S.A.	$3.00
Elsewhere	£1
First class mail (sealed envelope)	
Canada	$3.50
Other Commonwealth countries	£1 4*s.* 0*d.*
U.S.A.	$4.50
Other non-Commonwealth countries	£1 12*s.* 0*d.*

Published by the Proprietors The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

international fight for peace (see the Notes and D. N. Pritt's sparkling contribution); and the colonial question (H. B. Lim). It remains for you to use these *purposefully* to open eyes, especially of the thinking young man and woman (and she has not been forgotten: see *Danger! Women at Work*).

How to win a new reader? There is no single recipe, experience teaches us. One correspondent to Labour Discussion Forum ordered copies of that month and back numbers with the letter to which he was replying for 20 people also interested in the question: a good introduction. Frequently a visiting speaker at trade union and Labour Party branches, another reader always quotes from L.M.— and makes a point of acknowledging his source. Many a young trade union official does the same. (Yet I myself heard several speakers at public meetings in November and December draw freely on our articles without saying who they were quoting from!) Another reader, annoyed that his literature seller was always late with his L.M., began getting it direct for himself and a workmate. Now his order is five and they provide 'a bob a nob' to the fund, too. Some use the midget L.M. to rouse interest; others use back numbers. One got results by going over the Index in the December number and showing friends what they had missed. (URGENT! All wanting their 1957 Bound Volume should send me their loose sets immediately with 10s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. postage.) Pick the article most likely to interest. E.G., a Londoner found R.P.D.'s Notes *Economics and Politics of Increasing Misery* on Strachey's latest book went 'to the core of current confusions and doubt; should be read at least twice and thoughtfully digested.' Presents roll in, but will not be listed until February. November totalled:

£47 12s. 5d.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTIONS came from: 'California' in memory of Captain Herman Boetcher, U.S. Army, Spain-Pacific, £1; The Humphreys Family (pre-paid); A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; Olivia Greene, £2; D. M. Clarke, 10s; S. Morrissy, 10s; 'Republican', 5s; E.J.B., 10s; L. Bates, 4s 8d; R.F.B., £3; Royston Green, 3s 6d; 'Esperanto', 2s 6d; G. A. Hoyal, 2s 6d; 'L'Humanité', 3s; C.T.M., 'Mill Hill', 14s; R. McLeod, 5s; S. Mill, £1; 'Old Age Pensioner', 10s; L. Perkins, 5s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; T.W.R., £1 12s; W.B.S., 'Aye', 5s; J. A. Smith, 3s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s; H. Tinkler, 5s; D. Smith, 5s; Oliver Twist and Friends, 10s; M.S. (U.S.A.), 17s 8d; G. Elliot, 2s 1d; E. Strachan Rogers, £1 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDE: R. F. Willetts, 6s; J.S. (Vancouver), £2 9s; K. B. Forge, 10s; J. McKinnon, £1; E. Midgeley, 10s; R. A. Pollock, 7s; A. W. Wales, 5s; C. Thornhill, 5s; H. Barnett, 12s; A. Topham, 2s; D. Mukerji, 11s; A. W. Elliott, 2s; 'Anon', North London, 9s; F. Rogers, 2s; C. G. Roberts, 11s; C. H. B. Locke, 12s; H.E.W., 13s; H. Ullyatt, 5s; J. P. Mortimore, 5s; A. J. Horn, 10s; D. Bassett, 2s; Co-op. Divi., £1 5s 11d; J. Walkinshaw, 10s; J. Stewart, 2s; L. Conley, £1; C.M.M. (U.S.A.), £5 7s 2d; G. Hill, 2s; C. M. Truscott, 5s; K.S. (U.S.A.), £1 8s; H.Z. (U.S.A.), £1 1s 3d; Anon (Canada), 14s 6d; K.B.N. (U.S.A.), £2 16s 8d; A.S.L. (U.S.A.), £2 16s 8d; M.K. (U.S.A.), 7s; B.W.H. (U.S.A.), 7s 1d; W.R.P. (Canada), 10s 10d; J.P. (Mexico), 3s 5d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope. For overseas rates, see page 48) for year's subscription from the..... issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1957

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents, price £1 5s. 0d., or send 10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d., postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

THE MANAGER,
134 BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

Ready end of January

LABOUR RESEARCH

January issue includes:
'Overproduction?'
'Farming Today and Tomorrow'
'Block Grant'

Monthly 9d.; p.a. 10s. 6d.
LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly
Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement
Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE
Annual Subscription 21s.; 6 months 10s. 6d.
ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the.....issue to:—

(1) Name .....
Address .....

(2) Name .....
Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed .....
Address .....
.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED